

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| | APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| | 09/395,409 | 09/14/1999 | CHARLES CANTOR | 25491-2403D | 6005 |
| | 20985 7 | 590 09/12/2005 | | EXAMINER | |
| | | HARDSON, PC | CALAMITA, HEATHER | | |
| | 12390 EL CAN SAN DIEGO. | MINO REAL CA 92130-2081 | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 1637 | | |
| | | | | DATE MAILED: 09/12/2005 | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

| Application No. 09/395,409 | | Applicant(s) | |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|---------------|-----|
| | | CANTOR ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | -27 |
| | Heather G. Calamita, Ph.D. | 1637 | |

| Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief | Examiner | Art Unit | - | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| | Heather G. Calamita, Ph.D. | 1637 | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address | | | | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED 18 August 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A | | • | | | | |
| The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandon this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 4 (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of following time periods: | | | | | | |
| a) \square The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection. | | | | | | |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adv event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b) MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f | an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of . ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FI | f the final rejection. | | | | |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension a CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened stabove, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three month earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL | and the corresponding amount of the fee. atutory period for reply originally set in the | The appropriate extension final Office action; or (2) | on fee under 37 as set forth in (b) | | | |
| The Notice of Appeal was filed on 18 August 2005. A bri the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any repl AMENDMENTS | or any extension thereof (37 CFR y must be filed within the time period | 41.37(e)), to avoid di od set forth in 37 CFF | smissal of the R 41.37(a). | | | |
| 3. $oxed{\boxtimes}$ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, | but prior to the date of filing a brief | f, will <u>not</u> be entered | because | | | |
| (a) They raise new issues that would require further co | nsideration and/or search (see NO | TE below); | | | | |
| (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below) (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in below appeal; and/or | | educing or simplifying | the issues for | | | |
| (d) They present additional claims without canceling a | corresponding number of finally re | iected claims. | | | | |
| NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1 | | | | | | |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1 | | ompliant Amendment | (PTOL-324). | | | |
| 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s | | • | | | | |
| Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a the non-allowable claim(s). | illowable if submitted in a separate, | timely filed amendm | ent canceling | | | |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: | ⊠ will not be entered, or b) □ w vided below or appended. | ill be entered and an | explanation of | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-55, 58-76, 86, 88-144</u> . | • | | | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | | | | |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | | | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | ut before or on the date of filing a N Id sufficient reasons why the affida | lotice of Appeal will <u>r</u> vit or other evidence i | <u>iot</u> be entered is necessary | | | |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar | overcome <u>all</u> rejections under apper y and was not earlier presented. S | al and/or appellant fa see 37 CFR 41.33(d)(| ils to provide a 1). | | | |
| 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | on of the status of the claims after e | entry is below or attac | :hed. | | | |
| The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet. | at does NOT place the application in | n condition for allowa | nce because: | | | |
| 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). | (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper | No(s) | 1. | | | |
| 13. Other: | | , | r | | | |

hgc

JEFFREY FREDMAN PRIMARY EXAMINER

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303)

Application No.

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Appplicants state the new limitation comes from previously presented claim 55. This is not correct. Claim 55 does not teach probes with a single-stranded variable region. Additionally so specific basis for this amendment is identified so this claim may represent new matter.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants arguments are directed to claims as amended and because the amendment and since the amendment was not entered for the reasons above, the arguments will not be considered.